



**SOUHEGAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLANNING  
AREA COMMITTEE**

**NH Rivers Management and Protection Program**

New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services

PO Box 95 - 29 Hazen Drive - Concord, NH 03302-0095

Phone: 603-271-8801 Fax: 603-271-7894



**Souhegan Water Management Planning Area Committee Meeting**

**October 22, 2004**

**Milford Town Hall**

**Auditorium**

**1:30 pm – 3:30 pm**

**Members Present:**

Pierce Rigrod, Chair  
Nelson Disco  
Stephen J. Densberger  
Robin Warren  
Thomas Neforas  
Lawrence Major  
Nancy Rose Redling  
Timothy O'Connell  
F. Vincent Gerbino

**Members Absent:**

Peter de Bruyn Kops, Vice Chair  
Jay Chrystal  
Diane Fitzpatrick  
George May  
Angela Rapp  
William F. Ruoff  
Spencer C. Brookes II  
Pierre W. Bruno  
Gordon Leddy  
Senator Andrew R. Peterson

**Others Present:**

Michelle Hamm	Monadnock Paper Mill, SB155 Groundwater Commission
Ralph B. Pears	Monadnock Mountain Spring Water Co.
Jason George	

**Contractors:**

Jennifer Jacobs	University of New Hampshire
Tom Seager	University of New Hampshire
Tom Ballestero	University of New Hampshire
Don Kretchmer	Normandeau Associates, Inc.

**DES Staff Present – Watershed Management Bureau:**

Wayne Ives, Instream Flow Specialist  
Marie Loskamp, Executive Secretary

**The Chair, Pierce Rigrod opened the meeting at 1:20 pm.**

- I. Pierce Rigrod requested a Motion be made to approval meeting minutes of April 23, 2004.**

- **Motion made by Nancy Rose Redling to approve April 23, 2004 meeting minutes, seconded by Tim O'Connell and unanimously approved by members present.**

**II. Overview of the MCDA process for WMP development – Tom Ballestero – UNH and Tom Seager and Don Kretchmer – NAI**

- A. Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis defined.**
- B. Use of and results from MCDA**
- C. Role of the WMPAAC**

**Chairman Rigrod** turned meeting over to Wayne Ives to introduce the people from Normandeau Associates and UNH. They are here today to go over what is really the second phase of the project, which is the beginning of the Water Management Plans. The Water Management Plans will involve working with some of the stakeholders/water users. It is important to have everyone on the WMPAAC understand the process and understand how we are going to work through the recommendations and the information, the technical and scientific reports and the assessments that are created by UNH.

**Wayne** – This is a skip forward to the step beyond this next step. It is the process of how we are going to take the information that we have about the water use and the dams and how we are going to put together the three variables from the three sub-plans. We have three sub-plans that are a conservation plan, a water use plan, and a impoundment management plan. So we have three variables that have to add up to that protected instream flow value when it is finished. In order to do that, we have to weight these components by their availability and their effectiveness to reach that goal, and to a certain degree what this committee thinks is the value weighting of the protection that needs to be accomplished. We are still looking at the affected water users and what is important when it comes to dam management and affected users. Are public water supplies going to have higher or lower level of effort imposed upon them as far as reaching the protected instream flow goals set. This is a formalized process where you decide and then you make clear statements of what it is you are doing, as opposed to we will put a little here and a little there. This is a way to say up front, "This is how we are going to address this," and "These are the weightings that we are going to use." Today we will just get the concept of how the process works. Part of the decision and part of the information that goes into that may be feedback from this committee on what they feel is of higher or lower priority.

We have Don Kretchmer (NAI), Tom Ballestero, Tom Seager and Jennifer Jacobs (UNH) who are from the UNH, the University of Massachusetts and Normandeau Associates team doing this project and they are going to give us a presentation on this. I will turn the meeting over to Tom.

***The presentation by the team is on the DES web site.***

Tom Ballestero opened the presentation with where they have been and what has been completed to date. They spent three full days on the river this past summer identifying all of the protected instream flow IPUOCRs, or IPUOCRs the that we are expecting to protect, all the cultural resources, and just trying to document everything that they could. The result of the field efforts was the report on the IPUOCRs, instream and off stream, which is called the IPUOCR report. Now we have completed that report identifying everybody and anyone who is involved with using water on this river and those who are maybe near the river but not necessarily using water. Now they are trying to identify the water need for all of these IPUOCRs especially at the low flow times. Some water needs are high flows. For example, the Appalachian Mountain Club wants us to identify the flows for kayakers on the river. We are spending a lot of time on the river. The Univ. of Massachusetts crew has also been on the river looking at macroinvertebrates and fish communities that are in the river

and the wetlands people have also been doing this. We are all trying to define for each of these IPUOCRs how much water they need. The critical issue is what if there is not enough water for everyone, how do you make a decision. That is why we are here today. We are trying to get a hold on how we wrap our arms around all of these different and unique IPUOCRs that may have conflicting uses, especially in times of deficits or low flows. How do we start to make management strategy decisions?

At this point they are ahead of schedule except for Task 5. Task 5 couldn't be completed [this year] because the flows were too high and with the onset of winter, the bugs are gone. It is now highly likely that the flows will not get low enough until next July. Task 2 was to look at groundwater assessments and get final comments from the TRC. UNH will go out and interview groundwater users. This should have been done by September 2004.

Don Kretchmer identified the flow dependent resources identified in the report.

Tom Seager talked about the decision making process using Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA). The process was likened to any complex decision making process such as buying a car for a teenager who wants a fast, exciting car, who has little money, and has parents who want a reliable and safe vehicle. There may need to be compromise on some items and there may be agreement on others. The Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis formalizes the decision making process identifying the priorities of the water users, dam owners, and stakeholders and giving weights to the alternatives based on the level of preference. By successive iterations of surveys, the MCDA process allows the UNH team to quantify and score the desires and priorities of these groups in order to develop a spectrum of preferences for protection and management. By repeated questioning, the process will ensure clear communication and allow for reflection on changing perceptions of preferences. The times when compromise is required to meet the protected instream flow will then use the least burdensome, most preferred method to meet management goals.

### **III. Update on project status – Wayne Ives – NHDES**

#### **A. Completion of Souhegan Tasks**

#### **B. Souhegan work schedule over next months and remaining timeline & tasks**

Wayne laid out where we are heading. It is very important that the committee understand the decision making criteria, the process, and the specifics of it so that the committee can explain it to people and so the committee will have more confidence in which direction it should go. The committee should have another meeting to flesh it out and so it is clear where it is headed. Start getting a picture of the process in your mind so that you can absorb the information and so that you can start making criticisms about it. Everything sounds good the first time you hear it, and once it has jelled you start seeing and asking other questions. I hope that this committee comes to understand [MCDA] well enough so that they start seeing the benefits and the maybe the shortfalls and start helping to cement together something that will protect us from the shortfalls.

There will be a couple of rounds of the water use surveys. The initial contacts will be done by mid-winter. The instream aquatic community is what we cannot define until probably August. We have a numbers of IPUOCRs and we will not be able to describe what all their needs are. Some of the others we can get to before then. Except for the aquatic community, we will have the 'people-IPUOCR' needs assessed by around February or March. It was important to have some of the water use information ahead of time so that there are no surprises. It will make the tail end a little shorter.

### **IV. Other Business**

**Next Meeting:**

The next meeting will be held in about 6 months April-May 2005 (perhaps June) depending on getting a portion of UNH's dam and water user information for some actual examples of the MCDA process. The meeting will be scheduled later depending on progress on collecting this information. The contractors are available at any time to speak to committee members.

- **Chairman, Pierce Rigrod asked for a motion to adjourn, Tim made a motion to adjourn and Nancy seconded the motion, all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 3:31 pm.**

**Adjourned: 3:31 PM**